

STATE OF HAWAII
LAND USE COMMISSION

Approved 3-1-68

Minutes of Meeting

Kahului Library
Kahului, Maui

November 27, 1967 - 2:30 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Shiro Nishimura, Chairman Pro tem
Leslie Wung
Goro Inaba
Shelley Mark

Commissioners Absent: C. E. S. Burns
Wilbert Choi
Keigo Murakami
Jim P. Ferry

Staff Present: Ramon Duran, Executive Officer
Ah Sung Leong, Planner III
Dora Horikawa, Stenographer

Acting Chairman Nishimura announced that due to the lack of a quorum the action items on today's agenda will be deferred to a later date.

Persons planning to testify before the hearing were duly sworn in.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings of September 8, 1967 and October 13, 1967 were approved as circulated.

HEARING

PETITION BY EDWIN IGE (A67-164) TO RECLASSIFY 58 ACRES FROM AGRICULTURAL TO RURAL AT WAIAKOA, KULA, MAUI

It was again recommended in the staff report, presented by Mr. Duran, that the petition be denied because the petitioner had not submitted proof of need and since extensive vacant areas existed within the Rural District for residential expansion. Mr. Duran advised that the Maui Planning Commission's recommendation for approval was based on their previous recommendation. He pointed out that the same data contained in the original petition, denied by the Commission, has again been submitted and that no significant or new information accompanies this re-application. He also stated that unnecessary public expenditures to develop a county road for access to the proposed subdivision would be necessary.

Chairman Nishimura observed that extensive areas were designated Urban in the Kula District which were presently in agricultural use. Mr. Duran reflected

November 27, 1967

that this may have been due to the fact that residential and commercial uses are scattered all along the highway and the Commission, in determining the boundary, logically followed the property line in the back. However, during the reevaluation of the boundaries in the near future, this area in particular should be more realistically districted.

Petitioner Ige submitted that as a contractor having done most of the construction work in the area, he was thoroughly familiar with the Kula District. He stated that the bulk of the areas in the Jamestown Urban District were impossible to inhabit due to the deep gulches and the growth of tall wattle trees. He felt that denial of his original request was based on an untrue picture of the available urban lands in the Kula area.

Mr. Ige continued that there were a couple of subdivisions adjacent to his property almost completely sold, and that the undeveloped urban areas mentioned in the staff report were locations where people did not wish to buy. He also stated that the accessibility to the main government road and the view from his property made it more attractive to the prospective buyer. Electricity and water were available in the near vicinity and the developer would be responsible for the roadway within the subdivision.

The petitioner envisioned a development of approximately 90 lots on the 58-acre parcel comprised of predominantly $\frac{1}{2}$ acre lots with a few 1, $1\frac{1}{2}$ and 2 acre lots. The majority of the people expressing a desire to purchase within his subdivision were interested in $\frac{1}{2}$ acre lots.

Mr. Meyer Ueoka, attorney representing the petitioner, read a prepared report in support of the petition giving background of the petitioner, description of the parcel of land, arguments in support of the petition, and rebuttal of the staff report (see copy of report on file).

Mr. Ueoka confirmed that the population figure of 49,600 in his rebuttal statement included Molokai, Lanai as well as Maui.

Referring to the available undeveloped urban acres in the Kula District, Mr. Ueoka contended that some of these landowners had no intention of developing their lands and some were unable to because of financing difficulties. In fact much of these lands have been dedicated for agricultural purposes.

Due to the changing economic standards, Mr. Ueoka pointed to the demand for second homes by families.

Chairman Nishimura raised the question of the narrow roads in the vicinity of petitioner's lands and wondered if the County might not be burdened with the expense of widening these roads. In reply, Mr. Ueoka spoke of the possibility of purchasing a parcel that would connect with an adjoining subdivision complete with roads and this, together with an existing road along petitioner's property, would provide 2 accesses. Also, additional tax revenues realized from new property owners in the proposed subdivision could be used by the County for improvements.

November 27, 1967

Mr. Ige advised that the road leading into his proposed subdivision had a 40' right-of-way. Presently it was in a state of disrepair. However, with the approval of the subdivision, he felt that the County would bring it up to standard since this was the only road leading to the Lower Road.

Chairman Nishimura suggested that the petitioner submit a subdivision plan within 15 days of this public hearing to afford the Commissioners a clearer concept of his proposal.

Mr. Ige submitted that his decision to develop subject property had resulted from the numerous inquiries he had received from people interested in purchasing $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1-acre parcels for vacation and rental homes. The present 2-acre requirement under the agricultural districting would burden a small number of property owners with a heavier assessment for the improvements and would also affect the selling price of the parcels. The fact that roads need not be paved and can remain sub-standard, plus the variance in construction specifications, were pointed to as some of the disadvantages of the 2-acre subdivision.

As a contractor, Mr. Ige was confident that he would be able to develop a subdivision that would be a credit and asset to the County of Maui. He added he would be able to substantiate the demand for his proposed subdivision.

Mr. Ige further advised that the purchaser would be fully protected since the subdivision would have to meet all county standards and the developer would have to be bonded.

Mr. Ueoka reiterated the petitioner's ability and desire to develop his land as compared to some of the others who were merely sitting on their lands and will for generations to come.

Commissioner Mark commented that we were all looking for the right kind of development and wondered if the petitioner could see his way clear to wait another year when a reevaluation of all district boundaries would be undertaken by the Commission. He agreed that the petitioner had presented some valid points that deserved favorable consideration. However, this should take place under an orderly time scheme.

Since there was no further testimony, the hearing was closed.

NEXT MEETING DATE

December 15, 1967 in Honolulu, Hawaii was decided upon as the next meeting date.